DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 882 FL 008 309

AUTHOR Birmingham, John C., Jr.
TITLE Black English Near its Roots: The Transplanted West African Creoles.
PUB DATE 3 Nov 76
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the meeting of the American Dialect Society, (Atlanta, Georgia, November 5, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Creoles; *Diachronic Linguistics; Dialect Studies; *English; Language Research; *Language Variation; *Negro Dialects; Nonstandard Dialects; Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS *Black English

ABSTRACT

It seems highly likely that many of the features of Black American English can be traced back to the Afro-Portuguese Creole dialects that sprang up in the fifteenth century in Portuguese slave camps along the West African coast, particularly in the Gulf of Guinea area, the area of greatest concentration of activity during the slave trade. This Creole was used for communication by the Portuguese slave traders and the slaves on the one hand, and by the slaves themselves on the other hand, since these latter were drawn from many different African tribes speaking mutually unintelligible languages. Some of the early features of Black English have disappeared, due to contact with Standard English. For example, negation with "no" and the use of "me" as a subject pronoun are almost undoubtedly of Afro-Portuguese origin and are echoed in Jamaican Creole English. Other features of Black American English have remained and have exact parallels in the speech of certain blacks in the Caribbean, for instance, whose Creole dialects neglect gender distinctions, shun the "redundant" plural, and merge verb forms into one single form. Similarly, a Black English noun-deriving process is seen in the Creole dialects, as are other features commonly seen in Black English. (Author/CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132882

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John C. Birmingham, Jr.

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

John C. Birmingham, Jr.
Department of Foreign Languages
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia 23284

BLACK ENGLISH NEAR ITS ROOTS: THE TRANSPLANTED WEST AFRICAN CREOLES

John C. Birmingham, Jr.

Much has been written and said over the years about the characteristics and the grammar of American Black English, but until relatively recently not much had been revealed about how Black English acquired those characteristics and that grammar. There has been a good deal of guessing--intelligent and otherwise--by linguists and non-linguists alike, and the result of this guessing has been an attempt to explain the peculiarities of Black English on the basis of certain British dialects of English. It apparently has not occurred to these investigators to question the logic of their explanation: how could one who has never lived in the British Isles pick up all these traits of speech, even if one lived among people who had?

What is beginning to seem fairly obvious, thanks to the work of J.L. Dillard[1] and others, is that Black English, or whatever else we choose to call it, is the product of a relexification of an earlier creole, with a post-creole shift toward Standard English. This creole was itself probably based on an even earlier pidgin which in its turn may well have been merely a relexification of the now-extinct Lingua Franca,[2] and it more than likely developed in Portuguese slave camps (or factorias, as the Portuguese called them) along the West Coast of

FL008309

© John C. Birmingham, Jr. 1976

Africa. Dillard, in his Black English: Its History and Use in the United States (New York: Random House, 1972), says (p. 72), and I quote,

> As we know, the early slave traders practiced language mixing, so that the slaves could be more easily controlled. This forced the slaves to find a lingua franca, or language of wider communication, which turned out to be the Portuguese Pidgin which many of them had learned in the slave "factories" on the West Coast of Africa. Apparently, pidgin versions of French . . . and English began developing in the factories also. Slaves sent to French- or to Portuguese-speaking areas found it much easier to communicate in Pidgin French or Pidgin Portuguese than to find an African language in common; the restricted contact of most of them with their masters precluded their learning the standard language. In the United States, slaves in the Louisiana area--and perhaps, in the early days, elsewhere--utilized Pidgin French, now represented by the French Creole ("Gombo") of Louisiana. In most of the United States, however, a variety of English came to be the language of wider communication. When new generations grew up which used only the pidgin, the pidgin became creolized--the term used here is Plantation Creole.

Eugene D. Genovese, in his Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), lists (pp. 434-5) ten features of Plantation Creole or Early Black English, basing himself largely on the work of William A. Stewart and J.L. Dillard, and only hinting at the Afro-Portuguese contributions. It will be seen that some of these features are still characteristic of Black English but that others have fallen away as the language has moved closer to Standard English:

> First, the slaves normally relied on a zero copula; that is, they dropped the verb "to be"--and other verbs as well--and left it understood. "Which is that one?" became "Which dat one?" and "Mary is our daughter" was reduced to "Mary we daughter."
>
> Second, the slaves appeared to disregard gender. Nothing drove northern whites . . . quite so wild as the black's blurring of male and female. The slaves

had no difficulty understanding each other in this or any other regard, for they relied on context and familiarity to identify the sexes; they found the pronoun unnecessary. An ex-slave told her interviewer about a grandchild: "I raise him from baby." The interviewer then asked if her grandson helped her. Amused, she replied, "Wat dat? Him ain't no man, him my granddaughter, Ellen Jenkins. . . ."

Third, the personal pronoun usually accompanied the noun, as well as substituting for it. Thus, to say "Mary is in the cabin," a slave normally would say "Mary, he in cabin."

Fourth, pronoun forms were invariant. "His wife" became "he wife"; "our" and "us" usually became "we." When house slaves, or later, the freed men as a group, learned "us," the old pattern often continued. But instead of saying "We like he," they might say "Us like he."

Fifth, possession was marked by juxtaposition, not by the addition of "s" or by the form of the pronoun. Thus, "Mary's hat" became "Mary hat" or "he hat."

Sixth, the slaves negated with "no." The word "not" appeared in the speech of the house slaves and others, who copied the whites closely, but "no" was the standard in both verbal and adjectival formulations. Thus: "He no mind we" and "He no wicked."

Seventh, the slaves normally dropped suffix markers and reduced consonant clusters. "The girls are dressed" would certainly become "The girls is dress." And "stop" would become "'top" or "divorce," "'vorce." Gradually, words like "revorce" appeared, but these marked an attempt to speak standard English. The effort of uneducated blacks to speak as the whites did passed through an awkward stage of fancification. Thus, instead of the simple "'vorce," some would reach for "revorce," and eventually, "divorcement." By the time of emancipation the speech of the more assimilated slaves was riddled with "scatterment," "dividement," "separament," "worryment," and the like. The original speech of the field slaves had the virtue of a crisp directness that had stripped nouns of apparently superfluous prefixes and suffixes.

Eighth, the expression "There go [or, Here go] we-all stockings," does not mean "There go our stock-

> ings" but "There are our stockings." The use of "there go" and "here go" corresponds to the French use of voilà and voici, or the Spanish use of hay, or similar phrases in other Romance languages, and may reflect the influence of the European slave traders on the formation of pidgin English.
>
> Ninth, among the features of slave speech that carried over into modern black English were [sic] the dropping of words like "if," so that "See if he can go" would become "See can he go," and "What did you say?" would become the ubiquitous "Say what?" Also, multiple negation became the rule and greater emphasis accompanied the extended use of the negative: "He ain't never give none of we nothin'."
>
> Tenth, slaves did not form plurals in the manner of standard English. Their own formulation was nonredundant. Thus, "Gib massa tousand tank" for "Give master a thousand thanks"; or "some valiant soldier here" rather than "soldiers"; or "How much wife?" for "How many wives?"

The purpose of this present study will be to compare Black English (especially Early Black English) with a few creoles still spoken in the New World, most particularly with Papiamentu, an Afro-Iberian (probably Afro-Portuguese) creole of the Caribbean, spoken by some 200,000 people, mostly the descendants of African slaves, on the three Netherlands Antilles islands of Aruba, Bonaire, and Curaçao, sometimes known as the ABC islands. Papiamentu in its present state may be seen as a partially relexified version of the Portuguese Pidgin of West Africa, brought to the New World by the slaves beginning about the middle of the seventeenth century. Like the Taki-Taki or Sranan Tongo of Surinam, the Creole English of Jamaica, the extinct or nearly extinct Negerhollands or Black Dutch of the Virgin Islands, the Palenquero of the coast of Colombia, and other such creoles of the Caribbean area and elsewhere, Papiamentu has been going through a constant process of relexification

and decreolization.[3] These transplanted and relexified Afro-Portuguese creoles, however, will prove to have many features in common with Early Black English and even with Modern Black English. I shall therefore seek to show that Black English as we know it is very probably a relexification of the West African Portuguese Pidgin, keeping in mind the very obvious possibility that some similarities in the various speech forms may well be due to the workings of certain linguistic universals, particularly as regards pidgins and creoles.[4] I have chosen to deal almost exclusively with Papiamentu because, of the New World creoles, it is probably the most representative of creoles in general and of the Afro-Portuguese creoles in particular, and because it, unlike the other New World creoles, seems to have remained relatively unchanged from the original Afro-Portuguese model in syntax and morphology, although in its lexicon it has been strongly influenced by Spanish, Dutch, and English.[5] I shall not go into the native African substrata because such is not within the scope of my study.

Because of the succinctness of Genovese's ten-point list, I shall use that list as a point of departure for our discussion of the features of Early Black English as compared to similar features in Papiamentu and, to a lesser extent, in some of the other Caribbean creoles. We run into an exception right away: Genovese counts as the first feature of Black English the zero copula, but Papiamentu has a very highly developed concept of the copula, expressed most often by means of the verb [ta], derived from some form of the Portuguese (or perhaps Spanish) verb estar 'to be,' and expressed occasionally by means of the verb [sɛr] and such variants as the imperative ['sɛa] 'be' and other forms

traceable to the Iberian ser, likewise meaning 'to be.' The native Papiamentu form is [ta], however, and the verb [sɛr] and its variants may be shown to be relatively recent borrowings from Spanish,[6] given the proximity of the Dutch ABC islands to Venezuela and other Spanish-speaking areas. This [ta] serves two distinct and well-developed functions; it is first an indpendent verb meaning 'to be' in almost all functions of that copula verb, and secondly it is a verbal particle used in conjunction with a following infinitive, or base form, to mark the present-time aspect. The independent verb [ta] carries most of the meanings of the Iberian verbs ser and estar, without regard to the Iberian distinction of ser to express a characteristic and estar to express a condition. For example, Papiamentu would say [mi 'mama ta bu'nita] 'My mother is pretty' and [mi 'mama ta 'malu] 'My mother is sick,' in which [ta] serves for both ser and estar, respectively.

This [ta] as an independent verb may never be omitted. However, when it functions as an aspect marker, its use or omission depends on two very distinct factors. First, it is normally used only with verbs of physical motion, but even with those verbs it is omitted in cases of doubt, hypothesis, or other subjunctive-like constructions. Let us compare:

['ora ɛ ta baj kas | ɛ ta sosɛ'ga]

'When he (she) goes home, he (she) rests.'

['ora ɛ baj kas | lo ɛ sosɛ'ga]

'When he (she) goes home, he (she) will rest.'

The second Papiamentu sample above shows the future marker [lo], most likely deriving from the Portuguese logo 'soon.' It also shows

the omission of [ta] in the first clause to indicate an action still pending: he or she has not gone home yet. Secondly, this [ta] is almost always omitted before verbs of mental attitude (knowing, wanting, etc.), although there are some exceptions. The two verbs [baj] 'to go' and [sa:bi] or [sa] 'to know' will serve to illustrate the difference, noting also the tonality of the typical dissyllabic Papiamentu verb, the colon here representing vowel lengthening and the subscript numbers 2 and 1 showing rising pitch and falling pitch, respectively.

[ɛ ta baj] 'He (she) goes, is going.'

[ɛ sa:bi] or [ɛ sa] 'He (she) knows.'
2 1

All of this brings up another salient point which Genovese fails to mention; and that is the fact that the Papiamentu verb, like the Black English verb, is invariable from person to person, with the result that a subject noun or pronoun must nearly always be expressed. There are in Papiamentu perhaps no more than two verbal constructions which omit the subject noun or pronoun, one of these being the so-called impersonal construction, as in [ta jɔ:bɛ] 'It rains, is raining.'
2 1

Genovese's second statement is to the effect that the slaves did not observe grammatical gender, and here we have an exact parallel in Papiamentu. As some of the above Papiamentu samples show, the same pronoun serves for <u>he</u> and <u>she</u>, and also for <u>it</u> in a specific (that is, not impersonal) situation, such as 'It (the box, the merchandise, etc.) is here.' This invariable and non-distinguishing pronoun in Papiamentu is [ɛ], which is better thought of as [ɛl] ~ [ɛ], since before a vowel it is [ɛl] and in any other environment it is [ɛ]. In the matter of adjectives, too, Papiamentu rarely observes grammatical gender; and, al-

though this type of agreement would be of little concern to a speaker of English, it is interesting to note that Spanish and Portuguese, for example, maintain a strict masculine-feminine agreement between nouns and adjectives, with typical masculine nouns and adjectives ending in -o (Papiamentu, like Portuguese, tends to close final [o] to [u]) and typical feminine nouns and adjectives ending in -a. In Papiamentu, most adjectives display the etymological masculine form ([bu'nita], above, is one of the few exceptions), with any apparent agreement between noun and adjective being merely accidental. This same feature, of course, is evident in other creoles.

The third feature of Black English as listed by Genovese, that of a personal pronoun accompanying the noun, has no equivalent in Papiamentu. The latter language uses either a noun subject or a pronoun subject, but not both. But Papiamentu does have an interesting case of pronoun placement which is certainly not now a feature of American Black English. This type of placement occurs in a construction in which the European languages would employ a main clause and then a subordinate clause containing a preposition followed by a relative pronoun. Papiamentu places the pronoun (now a prepositional object pronoun, not a relative pronoun) at the end of the sentence, leaving the relative pronoun at the beginning of the subordinate clause. For example, whereas English would say 'This is the man with whom your daughter is in love' or, less formally, 'This is the man your daughter is in love with,' Papiamentu would say [ɛ sa:ki ta ɛ 'hombər ku bo ju mu'hɛ ta namo'ra di ǰɛ], (2 1) literally, 'This is the man whom your daughter is in love with him.'

Fourth, in the matter of the invariability of pronoun forms, Papia-

mentu fits the pattern almost perfectly. There is very little variation of the pronouns from one grammatical case to the next, although there is (and probably naturally so) more variation than is to be seen in Early Black English. The Papiamentu first person, for example, is [mi] all the way across, serving the functions of the English 'I, me, my, mine, myself.' And of course it is interesting to note the use of the form [mi] to serve all grammatical first-person functions in other Portuguese-based creoles of the New World, not to mention the Lingua Franca[7] and other creoles. This [mi] is also well documented in Early Black English. Dillard (1972, p. 90), for example, has the following short dialogue between a Lord Kidnapper and a Virginia slave named Cudjo:

> Lord Kidnapper--Can you shoot some of them rebels ashore, Major Cudjo?
>
> Cudjo --Eas, massa, me try.
>
> Lord Kidnapper--Would you shoot your old master, the Colonel, if you could see him?
>
> Cudjo --Eas, massa, you terra me, me shoot him dead.

Concerning number five, the matter of possession marked by juxtaposition, Papiamentu has no direct equivalent, even though that trait (and others as well) may perhaps be traced to native African sources.[8] Papiamentu shows possession in one of two ways: first, by means of a prepositional phrase introduced by [di] 'of, from,' as do the Iberian languages (and others, of course), as in [ɛ kas di ma'ria] 'Mary's house'; or, second, by means of the formula proper noun plus possessive adjective plus noun, as in [ma'ria su kas] 'Mary's house.' This latter

method strongly resembles the Dutch possessive construction, as in Marie haar huis, literally 'Mary her house,' so much so that it is entirely possible that Papiamentu owes this second construction to Dutch influence. In any event, juxtaposition plays no role in the Papiamentu possessive.

Genovese's sixth point has to do with negation by means of "no," and here we have an exact parallel in Papiamentu and, indeed, in many another creole, particularly and most obviously in the Iberian-based or Iberian-influenced creoles. This negation with "no" is well attested in Early Black English. Dillard (1972, p. 94), for example, quotes a source from the year 1807, which has the phrases "I no likee this massa Fopling. . . ." and ". . .he no half so good as Jemmy Seamore. . . ." It is curious here, by the way, to note Standard English "I" as the first person subject pronoun in "I no likee. . . .," where we would probably expect "me": "me no likee. . . ." As late as the time of the American Revolution we still see the subject pronoun "me," as well as negation with "no"; and Dillard (1972, p.87) quotes a paragraph from J.F.D. Smyth's A Tour of the United States of America, published in London in 1784, in which the author records the speech of a North Carolina slave as follows:

> Kay, massa, (says he), you just leave me, me sit here, great fish jump up into de canoe, here he be, massa, fine fish, massa; me den very grad; den me sit very still, until another great fish jump into de canoe; but me fall asleep, massa, and no wake till you come; now, massa, me know me deserve flogging, cause if great fish did jump into de canoe, he see me asleep, den he jump out again, and I no catch him; so, massa, me willing now take good flogging.

This "me" and this negation with "no" can doubtless be traced to the

Portuguese Pidgin and perhaps farther back than that, as we hinted in our discussion of Genovese's fourth point, the invariability of pronouns. In Papiamentu there is, for example, the phrase [mi no sa:bi] (2 1) or, as it would be colloquially, [min sa] 'I do not know,' which is echoed in the Jamaican Creole English mi no sabi 'I do not know,' now largely replaced by mi no nuo,[9] showing the substitution, by relexification, of English know for Portuguese Pidgin sabi. These points are all very neatly tied together by a sentence which Dillard (1972, p. 174) quotes from Charles William Day's Five Years Residence in the West Indies (London, 1852), showing the Black English of the Caribbean island of St. Kitts at about the middle of the nineteenth century: "Me no sabby why dat officer make noise wid dat ting." It would therefore seem, if these transcriptions are to be trusted, that the slaves of the New World used me as a subject pronoun, apparently the same [mi] which we observe in Papiamentu and other creoles. The "I no catch him" of Smyth's passage above, however, seems to show that me at least occasionally varied with I, again, that is, if the transcription is accurate. And Smyth records the use of the copula verb be, which Genovese claims to be non-existent: ". . .great fish jump up into de canoe, here he be, massa. . . ."

In point number seven, Genovese indicates the tendency on the part of the slaves to drop suffix markers and to reduce consonant clusters. This same tendency is to be seen in Papiamentu, which favors apocopated forms, at least compared with the equivalent Iberian forms. The above examples [ɛ kas di ma'ria] and [ma'ria su kas], both meaning 'Mary's house,' show the form [kas] 'house,' from Iberian casa. Similarly, [kos] 'thing' derives from Iberian cosa, cousa, or coisa and is reduced

even further in certain combinations, as in the interrogative [pa'kikoɨ] 'why?' literally 'for what thing?' It is in the etymological past participle forms that we see the process of apocopation perhaps more graphically than anywhere else, as in [sa'bi] 'known,' from Iberian sabido; [ma'ta] 'killed,' from Iberian matado; [pi'ka] 'sin,' from Iberian pecado, and so forth. Papiamentu reduces consonant clusters by epenthesis, the addition of a support vowel which, by assimilation, is usually the same as the vowel in the preceding syllable. Thus we see forms like [kolo'ga] 'to hang,' from Iberian colgar, and [dɛlɛ'ga] 'thin,' from Iberian delgado. The consonant cluster [gw] is typically reduced by dropping the [g], as in ['awa] 'water,' from Iberian agua, água.

In the second part of Genovese's seventh point we find a wealth of data for comparison. In the matter of "fancified" Black English noun forms ending in -ment, we see a very striking and perhaps revealing similarity in Papiamentu. Let us start with the very name Papiamentu itself: the word derives from the Portuguese (or perhaps Old Spanish[10]) verb papear 'to babble, to chatter,' plus the typical Portuguese noun-deriving suffix -mento, with closing of final [o] to [u], as in Portuguese. The resultant form Papiamentu thus means something like 'babblement' or 'babbling,' but interestingly enough it has none of the negative connotation of the Pidgin Portuguese original; it means merely 'talk' or 'talking.' Likewise, the Papiamentu verb [pa:pja] (2 1) 'to speak, to talk' derives from the same verb papear but does not carry any of the negative force of the original.[11]

But let us see some of the many other Papiamentu nouns ending in

-mentu formed by the creole itself, that is, nouns which do not exist in the parent Iberian tongues but which were invented according to the same specific creole pattern which produced the form Papiamentu:

[duna'mɛntu]	'giving'
[kibra'mɛntu]	'breaking, breakage'
[muri'mɛntu]	'death, dying'
[komɛ'mɛntu]	'meal, formal dinner'
[ponɛ'mɛntu]	'putting, placing, laying (of eggs)'
[jama'mɛntu]	'calling'
[purba'mɛntu]	'proving, proof'
[risibi'mɛntu]	'receiving, reception'
[skirbi'mɛntu]	'writing, spelling'
[kuminda'mɛntu]	'greeting'

and many others. This process holds a further point of interest for students of Black English: as J.A. Harrison[12] points out, Black English has or least had a tendency to stress the last syllable of words like wonderment (that is, wondermént) and judgment (jedgmént). While Harrison (op. cit., p. 173) attempts to trace this feature of Elizabethan English or to nineteenth-century Huguenot or Creole influence, it is just as probable--in fact, more so--that Black English only partially relexified these words ending in -ment (given the common Latin base of the noun-deriving suffix) and kept, at least for a while, the original Iberian stress pattern.

Eighth on Genovese's list is the expression "There go," with its variant "Here go," meaning 'there is, there are,' neither of which has a direct equivalent in Papiamentu. The closest thing to it is the use

of the verb [tiŋ] to serve double duty as the verb 'to have' and as the expletive 'there is, there are,' as in [mi 'tata tiŋ uŋ 'ɔwto] 'My father has a car' and [tiŋ 'hopi papja'mɛntu] 'There is much talking.' The latter phrase shows not only the form [papja'mɛntu] in the sense of 'talk,' but also the Dutch-derived[13] ['hopi] (literally 'little heap') to mean 'much, many.' The resemblance of this ['hopi] to Pidgin English 'heap' as a qualifier is interesting (see Dillard, 1972, pp. 175-6).

We may make a similar observation about Genovese's ninth item, the dropping of words like 'if' to produce "See can he go" rather than "See if he can go." Once again, Papiamentu has a highly developed structure in regard to words like "if" and "when." It does, however, share with Black English the tendency to maintain statement word order in a question, distinguishing between statement and question only by intonation. This important feature of Black English, which Genovese does not bring to light in his list, can be illustrated in Papiamentu like this:

[ri'kardo por ju'dami] 'Richard can help me.'

[ri'kardo por ju'dami?] 'Can Richard help me?'

The second part of Genovese's ninth point, however, has a counterpart in Papiamentu. Multiple negation, or the so-called double, triple, or quadruple negative, is alive and well in Papiamentu, not only in those instances in which the Iberian languages would demand at least a double negative, but also in situations where even Spanish and Portuguese would shun the use of more than two negatives. Spanish, for example, to express the idea 'I have never said anything,' would say (among other possibilities) 'Nunca he dicho nada,' employing only the

two negatives nunca and nada. Papiamentu, on the other hand, would say (again, among other possibilities) ['nuŋka mi no a bi:sa 'nada] or, more idiomatically, ['nuŋka mi na bi:sa 'nada], in either case using three negatives. The fondness for multiple negation which characterizes Black English could well come from the Portuguese Pidgin base, merely relexified into English, like so many of its other characteristics.

Genovese's final point has to do with nonredundant plurality, or the process of marking for plural by prefixing an adjective of quantity. What Genovese fails to point out, of course, is that the slaves probably did use the English plural morpheme -s where it was necessary for clarification--and only where it was necessary for clarification. According to Dillard (1972, p. 62), Black English has used the -s plural at least as far back as the early 1700's. Thus Genovese's statement on the matter should probably read to the effect that the slaves did not form some plurals in the manner of Standard English. In any event, Black English and Papiamentu are not alone in having the nonredundant plural, for some of the present-day West African Portuguese Creoles, for instance, do the same.[14] Papiamentu, just like Black English, has a plural morpheme which it uses primarily for clarification. This plural morpheme is [naŋ], which is also a third plural pronoun meaning 'they, them, their.' Thus, ['hɔmbərnaŋ] 'men,' but [dos 'hɔmbər] 'two men.' From a syntactic and morphological point of view, this Papiamentu [naŋ] finds its exact counterpart in the Jamaican Creole English plural morpheme dem,[15] from Standard English 'them,' serving also as a personal pronoun. For instance, Jamaican Creole speaks of di manggo 'the mango (a specific one)' and di manggo-dem 'the mangoes.'[16] However, to talk about mangoes in

general, Jamaican Creole would say simply m.nggo,[17] which shows no inflection for plural, nor does it need to. Papiamentu does precisely the same thing: [min gu:sta ba'nana] means 'I do not like bananas (in general),' while [min gu:sta ɛ ba'nananaŋ] means 'I do not like the (specific) bananas.' The same could well be true of Black English, and it is no doubt the complicated nature of the situation which leads traditional-minded linguists to the only partially correct conclusion that Black English has no plural morpheme.

There are other and more isolated points of morphological and syntactic similarity between Black English and Papiamentu, such as the Early Black English use of the particle a as a past-tense marker as in Dillard's (1972, p. 97) example of the English of the West Indies of the early nineteenth century, "Matty a l'arn matty" 'Friend taught friend,' in which we see the same tense marker that Papiamentu still uses, as in the difference between [mi ta baj] 'I go, am going' and [mi a baj] or, colloquially, [ma baj] 'I went.' And I have not even touched on the phonological similarities between the two speech forms, such as the short [u] sound for the Standard English off-glide [uw] sound, as in Black English [du] for Standard English [duw] 'do.' These and other phonological features of Black English may well derive from the same Portuguese and/or Spanish sources which also carried over into Papiamentu, with some almost certain phonological influence from native African languages, particularly as regards intonation and pitch. But in closing suffice it to say that the similarities are there if one will but look for them and that these similarities will be of invaluable help to us in our search for Black English near its roots.

NOTES

[1]See, for example, his All-American English (New York: Random House, 1975). His bibliography is especially good.

[2]My own theory can be seen in my article "Papiamentu: The Long-Lost Lingua Franca?" to be published in early 1977 in The American Hispanist.

[3]For specific examples, see my paper "Papiamentu: New Trends in Decreolization," presented in absentia at the Conference of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics in Guyana, August 1976.

[4]A good treatment of such linguistic universals can be found in Douglas Taylor's "Grammatic and lexical affinities of creoles," in Dell Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and Creolization of Languages (London: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 293-296.

[5]See note 3 above. The decreolization of Papiamentu is mainly lexical.

[6]One possible exception to the idea of a borrowed [sɛr] is the Papiamentu passive voice, which uses either the unconjugated infinitive [sɛr] or the Dutch-derived ['wɔrdu] (Dutch worden 'to become') plus (usually) an apocopated form of the Iberian past participle: [ɛl a sɛr ma'ta] or [ɛl a 'wɔrdu ma'ta] 'He (she) was (has been) killed.'

[7]See note 2 above.

[8]"Several African languages, such as Ibo, do not use possessive markers." The quotation is from Ivan Van Sertima, "Gullah and Oral Tradition," in Deborah Sears Harrison and Tom Trabasso (eds.), Black English: A Seminar (Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1976), p. 140.

[9]Frederick G. Cassidy makes this clear in his "Tracing the Pidgin Element in Jamaican Creole," in Hymes (op. cit.), p. 208.

[10]It is interesting to note that the verb papear is still used in modern colloquial Brazilian Portuguese, but it also existed in Old Spanish: "Fervos he sin los ojos, si mucho papeades. . . ." The quotation is from Gonzalo de Berceo's Vida de Santo Domingo de Silos, and can be seen, for example, on p. 14 of Richard E. Chandler and Kessel Schwartz, A New Anthology of Spanish Literature, Vol. I (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967).

[11]This same verb papear gave rise to similar forms for 'to speak, to talk' in other Afro-Portuguese creoles, such as the creole of the Cabo Verde islands, off Africa's west coast. Maria Dulce de Oliveira Almada, in her Cabo Verde: Contribução para o estudo do dialecto falado no seu arquipélago (Lisbon: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar, 1961), gives the following example (p. 157): e ta papiá mutu čeu 'ele fala muito' ('he talks much'). Compare Papiamentu [ɛ ta pa:pja 'hopi], same meaning. See note 13 for ['hopi]. See also my article "Papiamentu's West African Cousins," published Fall 1976 by Georgetown University Press along with twelve other selected papers from the Linguistic Society of America's

Second Colloquium on Hispanic Linguistics, held in July 1975 at the University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida.

[12]J.A. Harrison, "Negro English," in J.L. Dillard (ed.), Perspectives on Black English (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), p. 173.

[13]The Dutch word is hoop, but the Papiamentu ['hopi] seems to derive from the Dutch diminutive form hoopje or the dialectal hopie, in the same way that Papiamentu ['buki] 'book' derives from the Dutch diminutive boekje or boekie, literally 'little book.'

[14]For example, see Almada, op. cit., p. 91, paragraph 126.

[15]See Beryl Loftman Bailey, Jamaican Creole Syntax: A Transformational Approach (Cambridge: The University Press, 1966), p. 26.

[16]Ibid., p. 27.

[17]Ibid.